

## SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR SAN FRANCISCO SESSION FEBRUARY 7, 2012

The following cases are placed upon the calendar of the Supreme Court for hearing at its courtroom in the Ronald M. George State Office Complex, Earl Warren Building, 350 McAllister Street, Fourth Floor, San Francisco, California.

# TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2012—9:00 A.M.

(1)	S191400	People v. Manzo (Martin)
(2)	S178823	People v. Hernandez (Jacob Townley)
(3)	S097189	People v. Myles (John) [Automatic Appeal]
		<u>1:30 P.M.</u>
(4)	S033149	People v. Weaver (La Twon Regenial) [Automatic Appeal] (Liu, J., not participating; Epstein, J., assigned justice protempore)
(5)	S183961	Maldonado v. Superior Court of San Mateo County (People, Real Party in Interest)
(6)	S076721	People v. Jones, Jr. (William A.) [Automatic Appeal]
		CANTIL-SAKAUYE
		Chief Justice

If exhibits are to be transmitted to this court, counsel must apply to the court for permission. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.224(c).)

## SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA ORAL ARGUMENT CALENDAR SAN FRANCISCO SESSION FEBRUARY 7, 2012

The following case summaries are issued to inform the public and the press of cases that the Supreme Court has scheduled for oral argument and of their general subject matter. Generally, the descriptions set out below are reproduced from the original news release issued when review in each of these matters was granted and are provided for the convenience of the public and the press. The descriptions do not necessarily reflect the view of the court or define the specific issues that will be addressed by the court.

#### **TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2012—9:00 A.M.**

### (1) People v. Manzo (Martin), S191400

#11-54 People v. Manzo (Martin), S191400. (D055671; 192 Cal.App.4th 366; Superior Court of San Diego County; SCS212840.) Review on the court's own motion after the Court of Appeal affirmed in part and reversed in part a judgment of conviction of criminal offenses. The court limited review to the following issue: Could defendant be convicted of discharging a firearm at an occupied motor vehicle in violation of Penal Code section 246 if he was outside the vehicle at the time he discharged his firearm but the firearm itself was inside the vehicle?

#### (2) People v. Hernandez (Jacob Townley), S178823

#10-22 People v. Hernandez (Jacob Townley), S178823. (H031992; 178 Cal.App.4th 1510; Superior Court of Santa Cruz County; F12934.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal reversed a judgment of conviction of a criminal offense. This case presents the following issue: Did the trial court's gag order, which precluded defense counsel from discussing with defendant a sealed declaration of a testifying prosecution witness and a transcript of that witness's plea-agreement proceedings, so completely deprive defendant of his right to counsel as to constitute structural error reversible without a showing of prejudice or did the gag order implicate defendant's right to counsel in a manner requiring a showing of prejudice before reversal would be required?

(3) People v. Myles (John), S097189 [Automatic Appeal]

This matter is an automatic appeal from a judgment of death.

#### 1:30 P.M.

(4) People v. Weaver (La Twon Regenial), S033149 (Liu, J., not participating; Epstein, J., assigned justice pro tempore) [Automatic Appeal]

This matter is an automatic appeal from a judgment of death.

(5) Maldonado v. Superior Court of San Mateo County (People, Real Party in Interest), S183961

#10-93 Maldonado v. Superior Court of San Mateo County (People, Real Party in Interest), S183961. (A126236; 184 Cal.App.4th 739; Superior Court of San Mateo County; SC065313.) Petition for review after the Court of Appeal granted in part and denied in part a peremptory petition for writ of mandate or prohibition. This case includes the following issues: (1) Was the order compelling a mental examination of petitioner under Penal Code section 1054.3, subdivision (b), reviewable by pretrial writ? (2) Should the prosecution be permitted to attend the examination? (3) Should the results of the mental examination be disclosed to the prosecution before trial, or only after the defendant presents mental state evidence at trial? (4) Should the trial court review the results of the mental examination in camera and on the motion of the defense to determine if they contain privileged material?

(6) *People v. Jones, Jr. (William A.), S076721* [Automatic Appeal] This matter is an automatic appeal from a judgment of death.